STATE OF CALIFORNIA — DEPARTMENT OF FINANCE

ECONOMIC AND FISCAL IMPACT STATEMENT (REGULATIONS AND ORDERS)

. 399 (Hev. 2-98)	See SAM Section 6600 - 6680	for Instructions and Code Citations			
DEPARTMENT NAME	CONTACT PERSON	TELEPHONE NUMBER			
State Water Resources Control Board	Judy Reid	(916) 341-5760			
Orphan Site Cleanup Account Grant Progr		NOTICE FILE NUMBER			
Orphan Site Cleanup Account Grant Fig.	Tanj	Z			
	ECONOMIC IMPACT S	TATEMENT			
A. ESTIMATED PRIVATE SECTOR COST IMPA	ACTS (Include calculations and assump	tions in the rulemaking record.)			
Check the appropriate box(es) below to indicate	ste whether this regulation:				
a. Impacts businesses and/or emplo] a temporar constitution in the			
b. Impacts small businesses	,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,	e. Imposes reporting requirements f. Imposes prescriptive instead of performance			
c. Impacts jobs or occupations		g. Impacts individuals			
d. Impacts California competitivenes	ss V	 ה			
dpac.a od.iio//iia compeniavenes	\u00e4	h. None of the above (Explain below. Complete the Fiscal Impact Statement as appropriate.)			
h. (cont.) See attachment					
(If any box in Items 1 a through g is che	ecked, complete this Economic Impact St	latement.)			
		of businesses (Include nonprofits):			
	_				
Enter the number or percentage of total busine	esses impacted that are small businesses	S.			
		·			
Enter the number of businesses that will be created:eliminated:eliminated:					
Explain:					
Indicate the geographic extent of impacts:	Statewide Local or regional	(list areas):			
,	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	(100 0100).			
5. Enter the number of jobs created: or	eliminated: Describe the types	of jobs or occupations impacted:			
_					
Will the regulation affect the ability of California	a businesses to compete with other state:	s by making it more costly to produce goods or services here?			
Yes No If yes, o	explain briefly:				
B. ESTIMATED COSTS (Include calculations ar	nd assumptions in the rulemaking record.)				
What are the total statewide dollar costs that b	pusinesses and individuals may incur to co	omply with this regulation over its lifetime? \$			
a. Initial costs for a small business: \$					
b. Initial costs for a typical business: \$					
c. Initial costs for an individual: \$	0 0				
		sts: \$ Years:			
d. Describe other economic costs that may occ	our:				
	•				

ECONOMIC AND FISCAL IMPACT STATEMENT cont. (STD. 399, Rev. 2-98)

	m momple moustries are impacted, et	nter the share of total costs for t	each industry:
3.	If the regulation imposes reporting re	equirements, enter the annual co	osts a typical business may incur to comply with these requirements. (Include the dollar
	costs to do programming, record kee	ping, reporting, and other paper	erwork, whether or not the paperwork must be submitted.): \$
4.	Will this regulation directly impact ho	using costs? Yes	No If yes, enter the annual dollar cost per housing unit: and the
	number of units:		
	Are there comparable Federal regular		- The second of
	Enter any additional costs to busines	ses and/or individuals that may	be due to State - Federal differences: \$
C.	ESTIMATED BENEFITS (Estimatio		is not specifically required by rulemaking law, but encouraged.)
1	Righty summarize the banefits that n	acu repult from this regulation as	and who will benefit:
,,	blichy Summanze the Deficited that h	ray result from this regulation at	ind who will benefit:
_	A sa sha ha sa ƙara ta sa		
2.	Are the benefits the result of :	specific statutory requirement	, , , s = g == , = = = = = = = , washing,
	Explain:		
	MIL		
3.	what are the total statewide benefits	from this regulation over its life	etime? \$
D.	ALTERNATIVES TO THE REGULAT	TION (Include calculations and	d assumptions in the rulemaking record. Estimation of the dollar value of benefits is not
D.	ALTERNATIVES TO THE REGULAT ecifically required by rulemaking law,	TION (Include calculations and but encouraged.)	d assumptions in the rulemaking record. Estimation of the dollar value of benefits is not
D.	ALTERNATIVES TO THE REGULAT ecifically required by rulemaking law,	TION (Include calculations and but encouraged.)	
D.	ALTERNATIVES TO THE REGULAT ecifically required by rulemaking law,	TION (Include calculations and but encouraged.)	d assumptions in the rulemaking record. Estimation of the dollar value of benefits is not
D. <i>sp</i>	ALTERNATIVES TO THE REGULAT ecifically required by rulemaking law,	FION (Include calculations and but encouraged.) cribe them below. If no alternative	d assumptions in the rulemaking record. Estimation of the dollar value of benefits is not ves were considered, explain why not:
D. <i>sp</i>	ALTERNATIVES TO THE REGULAT ecifically required by rulemaking law, List alternatives considered and design	FION (Include calculations and but encouraged.) cribe them below. If no alternative and benefits from this regulation	d assumptions in the rulemaking record. Estimation of the dollar value of benefits is not ves were considered, explain why not:
D. <i>sp</i>	ALTERNATIVES TO THE REGULAT ecifically required by rulemaking law, List alternatives considered and described and	FION (Include calculations and but encouraged.) cribe them below. If no alternative	on and each alternative considered; Cost: \$
D. <i>sp</i>	ALTERNATIVES TO THE REGULAT ecifically required by rulemaking law, List alternatives considered and described and described are summarized the total statewide costs Regulation:	FION (Include calculations and but encouraged.) cribe them below. If no alternative and benefits from this regulation Benefit: \$	d assumptions in the rulemaking record. Estimation of the dollar value of benefits is not ves were considered, explain why not:
D. <u>sp</u>	ALTERNATIVES TO THE REGULAT ecifically required by rulemaking law, List alternatives considered and desc Summarize the total statewide costs Regulation: Alternative 1: Alternative 2:	rion (Include calculations and but encouraged.) cribe them below. If no alternative and benefits from this regulation Benefit: \$	d assumptions in the rulemaking record. Estimation of the dollar value of benefits is not ves were considered, explain why not:
D. sp	ALTERNATIVES TO THE REGULAT ecifically required by rulemaking law, List alternatives considered and desc Summarize the total statewide costs Regulation: Alternative 1: Alternative 2:	rion (Include calculations and but encouraged.) cribe them below. If no alternative and benefits from this regulation Benefit: \$	d assumptions in the rulemaking record. Estimation of the dollar value of benefits is not ves were considered, explain why not:
D. sp 1.	ALTERNATIVES TO THE REGULAT ecifically required by rulemaking law, List alternatives considered and described and	rion (Include calculations and but encouraged.) cribe them below. If no alternative and benefits from this regulation Benefit: \$	d assumptions in the rulemaking record. Estimation of the dollar value of benefits is not ves were considered, explain why not: on and each alternative considered; Cost: \$
D. sp 1.	ALTERNATIVES TO THE REGULAT ecifically required by rulemaking law, List alternatives considered and desired and de	rion (Include calculations and but encouraged.) cribe them below. If no alternative and benefits from this regulation Benefit: \$	d assumptions in the rulemaking record. Estimation of the dollar value of benefits is not ves were considered, explain why not: on and each alternative considered: Cost: \$
D. sp 1.	ALTERNATIVES TO THE REGULAT ecifically required by rulemaking law, List alternatives considered and desired and de	rion (Include calculations and but encouraged.) cribe them below. If no alternative and benefits from this regulation Benefit: \$	d assumptions in the rulemaking record. Estimation of the dollar value of benefits is not ever were considered, explain why not: Cost: \$

ECONOMIC AND FISCAL IMPACT STATEMENT cont. (STD. 399, Rev. 2-98)

*. Will the estimated of	costs of this regulation to California bus	iness enterprises (exceed \$10 million ?	Yes No //f N	o, skip the rest of this seci
Briefly describe each Alternative 1:	h equally as effective alternative, or co	ombination of altern	natives, for which a cost-effe	ctiveness analysis was	performed:
	and each alternative just described, ent \$ \$ \$	er the estimated to	· · · · · ·	: \$.
	FIS	CAL IMPAC	T STATEMENT		
	N LOCAL GOVERNMENT (Indicate ap the current	opropriate boxes 1 year and two subs	through 6 and attach calcula equent Fiscal Years)		
<u></u>	enditures of approximately \$ticle XIII B of the California Constitution	. and occions 110	oo et seq. of the Governmer	nt Code. Funding for this	reimbursement:
a. is prov	ded in,8	udget Act of) or (Chapter	,Ste	atutes o
2. Additional expe	requested in the(FISCAL YEAR) Inditures of approximately \$ ticle XIII B of the California Constitution the rederal mandate contained in	in the cu and Sections 1750	rrent State Fiscal Year whic 00 et seq. of the Governmen	h are not reimbursable b It Code because this reg	
b. implem	nents the court mandate set forth by the)			
court	in the case of		VS		<u> </u>
c. implem	nents a mandate of the people of this St	tate expressed in th	neir approval of Proposition I	No	at the
d. is issue	ed only in response to a specific reques	t from the			(DATE)
			, v		
e. will be i	fully financed from the		FEES, REVENUE, ETC.)		authorized by Section
		of the	·		Code:
f. provide	s for savings to each affected unit of loo	cal government whi			
4. No additional co	sts or savings because this regulation n	nakes only technica	ıl, non-substantive or clarifyi	ng changes to current la	w regulations.

ECONOMIC AND FISCAL IMPACT STATEMENT cont. (STD. 399, Rev. 2-98)

5. No fiscal impact exists because this regulation does not affect any local entity or program.							
6. Other.							
B. FISCAL EFFECT ON STATE GOVERNMENT (Indicate appropriate boxes 1 through 4 and attach calculations a the current year and two subsequent Fiscal Years.)	and assumptions of fiscal impact for						
Additional expenditures of approximately \$ in the current State Fiscal Year. It is antic	ipated that State agencies will:						
a. be able to absorb these additional costs within their existing budgets and resources.							
b. request an increase in the currently authorized budget level for thefiscal year.							
2. Savings of of approximately \$in the current State Fiscal Year.	.'						
3. No fiscal impact exists because this regulation does not affect any State agency or program.							
4. Other.							
C. FISCAL EFFECT ON FEDERAL FUNDING OF STATE PROGRAMS (Indicate appropriate boxes 1 through 4 and attach calculations and assumptions bliscal impact for the current year and two subsequent Fiscal Years.)							
	··· -						
1. Additional expenditures of approximately \$in the current State Fiscal Year.							
2. Savings of of approximately \$							
3. No fiscal impact exists because this regulation does not affect any federally funded State agency or program.							
4. Other.							
SIGNATURE & CONTRACTOR OF THE SIGNATURE	TITLE						
& William -	11/61/2005						
AGENCY SECRETARY	DATE						
APPROVAL/CONCURRENCE & ///CL	11/14/2005						
PROGRAM SUBGET MANAGER DEPARTMENT OF FINANCE ;	DATE						
APPROVAL/CONCURRENCE S	1 1						

- The signature attests that the agency has completed the STD. 399 according to the instructions in SAM sections 6600-6680, and understands the impacts of the proposed rulemaking. State boards, offices, or department not under an Agency Secretary must have the form signed by the highest ranking official in the organization.
- 2. Finance approval and signature is required when SAM sections 6600-6670 require completion of Fiscal Impact Statement in the STD, 399.

Attachment to Form 399

Department Name:

State Water Resources Control Board

Descriptive Title:

Orphan Site Cleanup Account Grant Program

Economic Impact Statement

A. Estimated Private Sector Cost Impacts

1. h. The proposed regulations do not impose cost impacts to any of the private sector categories listed. Section 25299.50.2 of Chapter 6.75 of division 20 of the Health and Safety Code requires the State Water Resources Control Board (State Water Board) to conduct a grant program to clean up sites contaminated by releases of petroleum from underground storage tanks where no financially responsible party exists.

The proposed regulations implement and make specific the statutory provisions. The regulations do not impose any additional obligations or cost impacts upon the private sector recipients of the grants.